

Debra I. Grassgreen (CA Bar No. 169978)  
Miriam Manning (CA Bar No. 178584)  
PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP  
One Market Plaza, Spear Tower  
40<sup>th</sup> Floor, Suite 4000  
San Francisco, CA 94105-1020  
Telephone: (415) 263-7000  
Facsimile: (415) 263-7010  
E-mail: dgrassgreen@pszjlaw.com  
mmanning@pszjlaw.com

David J. Bradford (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Catherine Steege (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Terri L. Mascherin (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Katharine R. McLaughlin (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
353 N. Clark St.  
Chicago, IL 60654  
Telephone: (312) 222-9350  
E-mail: dbradford@jenner.com  
csteeg@jenner.com  
tmascherin@jenner.com  
kmclaughlin@jenner.com

*Attorneys for Defendant  
Uber Technologies, Inc.*

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

In re:

ANTHONY SCOTT LEVANDOWSKI,  
  
Debtor.

ANTHONY SCOTT LEVANDOWSKI, an  
individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

Defendant.

Case No. 20-30242 (HLB)

Chapter 11

Adv. Pro. No. 20-03050 (HLB)

**UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S  
MOTION IN LIMINE BARRING  
ALLEGED EVIDENCE AND  
ARGUMENT ABOUT UBER'S  
ALLEGED MOTIVATIONS AND  
INTENT TO HARM GOOGLE**

1 Uber Technologies Inc. (“**Uber**”) respectfully moves in limine (“**Motion**”), pursuant to Rule  
2 7016 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure and Rule 16(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil  
3 Procedure, for an order barring Google LLC (“**Google**”) from presenting any evidence or making any  
4 argument regarding Uber’s alleged motives towards Google or an alleged secret scheme to harm  
5 Google because such evidence and argument is irrelevant in plaintiff and Debtor, Anthony  
6 Levandowski’s (“**Levandowski**”), breach of contract action. To date, Levandowski has not alleged or  
7 argued that he participated in a secret scheme with Uber intending to harm Google, but such an  
8 argument would be equally irrelevant to Levandowski’s claims and defenses whether made by  
9 Levandowski or by Google. Accordingly, if Levandowski adopts this argument to assist Google, Uber  
10 moves to bar Levandowski from making the same argument or presenting this alleged evidence as  
11 well. This Motion is supported by the accompanying memorandum of points and authorities and the  
12 omnibus declaration of Katharine McLaughlin.

13 Dated: January 31, 2022

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP

14 By /s/ Debra I. Grassgreen  
15 Debra I. Grassgreen  
16 Miriam Manning

--and--

17 JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
18 David J. Bradford  
19 Terri L. Mascherin  
Catherine Steege  
Katharine R. McLaughlin

*Counsel for Uber Technologies, Inc.*